1. This action seeks a declaratory and permanent injunction order against the Defendant. The widely viewed public evidence for this action is based on this foundation of public evidence of: 1) In the Defendant's own autobiography he states his birth father was NOT a U. S. citizen 2) On national TV viewed by millions of people the Defendant accepted the title of "Nobel Peace Prize" and the money that came with it 3) the Defendant issued an Amended Executive Order #12425 which is found on the White House's web page; and 4) on national TV before millions of people the Defendant accepted and acted as the Chairperson of the United Nations. The Defendant made use of the word, "EXCEPT": it was used to deny his eligibility, "No person except a natural born Citizen....shall be eligible to the office of the President..," (Article 2,§1 clause 5) and in his amended Executive order of 12425 the Defendant removed the security provisions for Plaintiff, from the order by deleting the word "except" in the beginning, changing the entire meaning so that all security for the United States and its citizens are no longer protected... 'except those provided by Section 2(c), Section 3, Section 4, Section 5, and Section 6 of that Act" and the semicolon that immediately precedes them", Amended executive order #12425. The Defendant's "amended" order took away the word except and provided immunities and protection for an International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) under other governments giving away the sovereignty of the U.S. The Plaintiff has Constitutional standing to bring this complaint before this court under U.S. Constitution Article 3 because it involves a 'Constitutional Controversy' and over throw of the United States Government by destroying the Constitution and the Plaintiff's

inalienable rights therein. This Court has jurisdiction for "nonstatutory review." This Honorable Court has no choice; this jurisdiction is mandated by the Supreme Law of the United States Constitution, Article VI. The Defendant's birth father, Barack Obama, was born into Kenya's Luo tribe. Kenya was under British rule as was Barack Obama, Sr.'s children. The Defendant's birthright was under The British Nationality Act of 1948. Our First Chief Justice John Jay wrote: "Permit me to hint, whether it would be wise and reasonable to provide a strong check to the admission of Foreigners into the administration of our national Government; and to declare expressly that the Commander in Chief of the American army shall not be given to nor devolve on, any but a natural born Citizen." John Jay was the person responsible for having article 2, section 1 clause 5 inserted into the Constitution, which was derived from the 'Law of Nations". The Defendant as one whose birthright is of foreign roots has brought a foreign unknown individual into the highest position of the United States of America. He has refused to provide any information to the public and the Plaintiff to something which is as basic as his legal name. There is not ever proof he is a United States citizen but yet he sits in his "Trojan Horse" aka the White House. There is an unknown dictator in one of the 3 branches of U.S. government with the 2nd branch failing in their mandate to protect the Plaintiff and the People. This leaves only the Judiciary Branch of government left to now uphold the highest Law, The Supreme Law, before our country is overturned to those of foreign lands. Article 2, section 1 clause 5 mandated this not to happen, but someone failed to uphold their duties as an officer of the United States of America. The U.

S. Constitution mandates that it is this Honorable Court's province and duty to uphold the Supreme Law. The Supreme Court is the final word on what the Constitution means, and the Defendant's birth father was not a United States citizen, thereby making him ineligible to be the President of the United States thereby creating a state of emergency for the security of the United States. As this document is filed, there is an unknown person who occupies the office of the U. S. Presidency with his own words he is a result of a birth of a foreign citizenship father. As a direct and proximate result Plaintiff has suffered fundamentally a specific harm identified as the most horrific harm that can be filed under the jurisdiction of the U. S. federal courts of one named citizen of her U. S. Constitutional rights she has being violated by the Defendant. Nothing in this Land could be more of value and more a harmed right with a priority of mandate from Article VI the Supreme Law of the Land. More specific harm is addressed elsewhere.

2. Plaintiff was born in a large hospital in the continental United States. She has no other citizenships nor has she requested any. Plaintiff's mother and father were both born in West Virginia, U.S.A. Neither parent left the United States during their lifetime. Plaintiff is a United States citizen maintaining her domicile and residence in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. She presents in good standing having never been arrested and has always maintained good moral turpitude. This is a verified complaint of the Plaintiff against the Defendant's violation of rights she has under the <u>United States</u>

<u>Constitution</u> to have as her president a "natural born" citizen of the United States.

27

28

3. Plaintiff respectfully requests this Honorable Court to immediately issue an order sua sponte for the Defendant to show cause and absolute proof of his "natural born" citizenship eligibility, which is a requirement of the United States Constitution to be the United States President. As well, the U.S.'s security is at risk and the Plaintiff demands proof the Defendant is even a United States citizen or has a current Visa with supporting authenticated documents of how they were produced. The Defendant has failed to provide this proof. The Defendant has chosen to go into the highest position of public office and as such has not privacy rights concerning this proof. The Plaintiff demands immediate proof of his Constitutional eligibility to be filed in this court and upon failure to file absolute proof of his "natural born" birth status, Plaintiff asks this court for a permanent injunction to remove the Defendant from office of the president of the U.S. This Court is mandated from the Supreme Law which states this Judicial Court must enforce and protect the U.S. Constitution specifically Article 2 section 1 paragraph 4.

4. Time is of the essence as the security of the Plaintiff's Country is at stake and the crescendo of the harm she incurred is a result of the destruction being perpetrated by this Defendant on her United States Constitutional rights. This is a complaint involving U.S. Constitutional Controversy which if not dealt with swiftly, will destroy the United States as it stands under the United States Constitution. This honorable Court has taken its oath of office to uphold the <u>United States</u>

<u>Constitution</u> where in this controversy of the compliant lies.

5.This Defendant failed to provide proof of his eligibility for the United States presidency. The Defendant's father was not a United States citizen precluding the possibility of the Defendant being a "natural born" citizen. The Supreme Law is NOT negotiable; no man or office may change it. The Defendant could never be the President of the United States as he is not eligible for this office. It is prohibited in the <u>United States Constitution Article 2</u>, Section 1, Paragraph 5 of the <u>Constitution</u> that those who are not "natural born" citizens may never be the President of the United States of America.

6.The Defendant's father was not a United States Citizen which prevented the Defendant being the U.S. Constitution required "natural born" citizen. There are other violations of the Plaintiff's right she has under the United States Constitution.

7.The Plaintiff hopes this court will order sua sponte the Defendant to provide a showing of cause with proof of his being a "natural born" citizen. In the alternative she seeks a permanent injunction for the Defendant to cease and desist in his presumed position of the president of the United States of America. There is no impeachment option as the Plaintiff assets this Defendant is not the president because he was never eligible to be president and he deliberately committed fraud upon the Plaintiff.

8. The Plaintiff is requesting declaratory relief to declare the Defendant constitutionally ineligible at all times for the office he now occupies. The Plaintiff seeks this complaint pursuant to the <u>Supremacy Law Article VI U. S. Constitution</u> and pursuant to <u>42 U.S.C. section 1983 and 28 U.S.C. section 1331</u> for the Defendant's violation of her rights she has under the

United States Constitution. She seeks injunction relief in the form of removing the Defendant from the U.S. Office of the President forever. 9. Clearly the Defendant campaigned in California, received 55 electoral votes from California and currently is the presumed President of the U. S. in California. Clearly, the State of California Secretary of State failed in any type of duty she had to verify the Defendant was a "natural born" citizen before he was placed on the ballot. Clearly, Nancy Pelosi, congresswomen of California and Speaker of the House violated her oath to uphold the U.S. Constitution Article 2 § 1 clause 5, to verify the Defendant was a "natural born" citizen and hold hearings in the absence of documented proof among questions. Instead, the Speaker of the House Pelosi merely stipulated the Defendant was from Hawaii. Stipulating to facts is circumventing the Constitution which requires verification of birth allegiance to the United States to insure whole birth allegiance to the U.S. and its security. If Congresswomen Pelosi had upheld article 2,§ 1 clause 5, then the Plaintiff would not have incurred her damages. The Plaintiff believed the officials responsible for insuring the viability of presidential candidates would fulfill their oath they took as a U.S. and state officer to uphold the U.S. Constitution; they did not. The Plaintiff went to the voting booth fully believing officials had verified the Defendant's constitutional eligibility threshold to wholly be a "natural born" citizen and not of a foreign parental birth. As a result of this failure, the Plaintiff now must ask this Judicial Federal Court to uphold and enforce the rights the Plaintiff has under the federal constitution which this Defendant violated.

The Defendant failed to provide absolute proof by certified documents leading to the Plaintiff receiving continuing harm and future harm as a result.

10. The Defendant's acts are operating under color of the law in an official capacity when he violated the rights the Plaintiff had under the Constitution and in his individual capacity where he violated the rights the Plaintiff had under the U. S. Constitution. As a Democratic Presidential candidate and as the presumed President the Defendant has, does and will operate under the color of the State of California as well as the United States. The Defendant clearly was informed as to the rights the Plaintiff had as a U. S. citizen under the United States Constitution and could have no immunity to violating the rights Plaintiff has within.

11. While the Plaintiff does rely on the Defendant's autobiography to where his father was born and raised in Africa/Kenya and of the specific Lau tribe; the Plaintiff has read in numerous books on the subject of the Defendant and the one fact which has never been disputed is that his birth father was born in Africa. This is prohibited by Article 2,§ I clause 5; "No person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President". The framers of the Constitution had very real and concrete concerns of tyranny they had experienced while still British colonies.

Parties

12. The Plaintiff, Ruth Jones, is hereafter called Plaintiff. The Defendant goes by the name of Barrack Hussein Obama II in the duties as the

1 p 2 7 3 u 4 b 5 I 6 n 7 (8 s 9 a 10 a 11 v

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

presumed President of the U. S. and will hereafter be called Defendant. The Plaintiff does not know the legal name for the Defendant as he has used many names. Some of the names connected to the Defendant have been Steve Dunham, and Barry Soetero. The Plaintiff herself heard the Defendant while giving a speech and with a laugh said his middle name might be Steve. The quip was also transcribed and published by the Chicago Sun Times on Oct. 16, 2009, the key section of which reads: "It's shocking. That was a tough primary you had there, John. Anyway, anyway, that's who I really am. But in the spirit of full disclosure, there are a few October surprises you'll be finding out about in the coming weeks. First of all, my middle name is not what you think. It's actually Steve. That's right. Barack Steve Obama."

Geographical Jurisdiction

13. The Plaintiff had her residence and domicile in the county of Los Angeles, California for all times relevant before, during and after the filing of this suit. This Central District of California is the proper courthouse in which to bring this suit as Los Angeles country is where the harm occurred and were the Plaintiff lives. The Defendant's current physical address is The White House 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20500.

Person and Subject Matter Jurisdiction

14. Although the U. S,. Constitution does not include "standing" the Plaintiff will address it nevertheless. The Plaintiff lives and lived in the Los Angeles County where the harm is a continuing violation by the Defendant of the rights she has under the U. S. Constitution. While the Defendant does now reside in Washington, D. C. he was on the ballot as

2728

California, County of Los Angeles. 15. The Defendant was the winner of the electoral votes in California. The Defendant was an illegal candidate for the office of the President as he failed to provide to the Plaintiff or others who either are requesting such information through any available mechanism that he was a "natural born" citizen with BOTH his mother AND his father being only citizens of the United States. The Defendant received 55 of electoral votes from the State of California. The Defendant was and is currently presumed to be the President of the United States. The State of California is a state under the United States. The Speaker of the House, Nancy Pelosi from California, failed to verify with proof, the Defendant's "natural born" citizen ship status to be eligible to be a candidate for the office of the President to the United States. Instead they just agreed or stipulated that the Defendant was from Hawaii. Ms. Pelosi failed in her responsibility to Plaintiff to uphold the U.S. Constitution. Numerous lawsuits have been filed as a result of the failure of these checks and balances which failed to uphold the Plaintiff's rights she has under the United States Constitution. 16. This complaint is against the Defendant in his official and his unofficial capacity. This complaint is also against the Defendant in the capacity of an individual who is in fact a de-facto president of the United States but in actuality is NOT the president of the United States of America since he has never provided proof that he is a "natural born"

Land, the <u>United States Constitution</u> prohibits the Defendant becoming the President without his providing proof to the U. S. Citizens (Plaintiff) that he is indeed a "natural born" citizen. The Defendant clearly knows he as seeking this public position has a Constitutional obligation to provide the Plaintiff and the People with his proof of his being, "natural born".

17. The Defendant is technically not the president of the United States of America as he has never provided proof he is a "natural born" citizen. The current facts show the Defendant has received a "pass" all his life, without producing any evidence. The Defendant has not provided the Plaintiff with proof he is even a United States citizen or even has a Visa to be legally in the U.S. prior to being elected to the office as president of the United States of America. This Defendant was requested publicly and in Courts of Law of the United States to provide the People (Plaintiff) with proof he was eligible to serve as the President of the United States.

18. The Defendant has chosen not to provide proof he is a "natural born" citizen or even that he is a citizen of the United States. Instead he spent thousands of dollars to attorneys to secure protective orders to keep all his records private. Even though there are numerous requests to him and the media for his disclosure of his citizenship constitutional status the Defendant continues to fail to provide this disclosure as required by the <u>U. S. Constitution</u>. This Defendant with many of his programs such as his new health reform require all citizen's electronic disclosure of private medical records of the Plaintiff who has never sought a public office, while he who holds the highest office in the U. S. refuses to

provide proof of his certified birth certificate showing the name of his mother and where she was born, the name of his father and where he was born, and the hospital and the attending signature of the physicians where the Defendant was born; born in the U. S. in 1961 reportedly by the stipulation of Ms. Pelosi; which leads to another "pass" for the Defendant as to his age which is also a requirement to be the President. There are allegations the Defendant was actually born on the soil of Kenya but no proof because the Defendant refuses to provide proof. The facts which we know according to the book written by the Defendant is that his father and grandfather were born in and citizens of Kenya; his young years growing up in Indonesia and adopted by his Indonesia stepfather.

19. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction as there is no person and no office above obeying and falling under the jurisdiction of the <u>United States Constitution</u>. This Supreme Law of the Land supersedes all treaties and all federal law; there is no law higher than the U. S. Constitution much to the chagrin of the Defendant. The Federal Court is the proper place to hear this issue which was violated by the Defendant and further the officer failed to uphold their accountability under the Supreme Law.

20. This includes the office of the United States Presidency and the Judges in every state. This Court has mandated subject matter from the United States Constitution and by the United States Constitution, The Supreme Law of the Land. The Plaintiff's compliant is against this Defendant who is an unknown doe type of individual who is "presumed" to be the president of the U. S. but who is not in reality as this person

28

could never be as he has not provided proof of his eligibility of his constitutionally required "natural born" United States citizenship status making it constitutionally impossible for the Defendant to be a U.S. President. The Defendant is a "doe" because he refuses to provide his certified identity to insure the security of the U.S. the safety of the Plaintiff and the proof he is even in the U.S. lawfully. The Defendant was never eligible to be the U.S. president and so he could never be.

Subject Matter And Constitutional Jurisdiction

21. The United States Constitution the Supremacy Law, Article VI, mandates that the United States Constitution is the Highest Law of the Land of the United States of America. This Supremacy Law mandates that "all judges" in the United States take an oath to uphold the U.S. Constitution and that all Judges whether they wish to or not are mandated by the Highest Supreme Law in the United States of America to hear and determine cases brought before them which include a controversy of a violation of the United States Constitution. This claim also has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 USC section 1331 (federal question 20 | jurisdiction) and 28 USC section 2201 (declaratory judgment act). 21 22. This action is brought directly under Article II section 1 paragraphs 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, section 2 paragraph 2; Article III section 1, 2, 3; Article VI paragraph 2, 3; The whole U.S. Constitution. 23. The Plaintiff's complaint is that the Defendant violated the right she has to a president who is a "natural born citizen" and whose allegiance is solely to that of the United States. This inalienable right of Plaintiffs which this Defendant has violated is written in the United States Constitution, Article II Section I, "No person except a natural born Citizen...shall be eligible to the Office of President". Plaintiff's right

under the <u>U. S. Constitution</u> is violated by the Defendant. This Court is mandated by the Supreme Law of the United States of America, the <u>United States</u>

<u>Constitution</u>, to jurisdiction of this complaint and remedy requested herein. The Plaintiff's complaint is her protected right as a citizen of the United States which this Defendant has and continues to violate. As the <u>United States Constitution</u> is written in <u>Article VI</u> "This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the Supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding. The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States."

24. To this end, this Court is mandated from the Highest Supreme Law of the United States Constitution to jurisdiction of the United States Constitutional Controversy as a result of the Defendant's violations of the Plaintiff's federal constitutional right to a president who meets the threshold eligibility qualifications written in the United States Constitution.

25. The Controversy is the Defendant has utterly failed and refused to provide to the Plaintiff any way possible that he meets the threshold eligibility requirements to be a president of the United States of America. By not meeting these eligibility requirements the Plaintiff's Country of the United States is now vulnerable to a plethora of threats from its enemies because this Defendant has shown no proof of his legal sole loyalty to the United States to be the Commander in Chief and the President of the United States. The Defendant operates his agenda with

unconstitutional acts putting the Plaintiff's life, liberty and freedom at risk with actions to insure the destruction of Plaintiff's Country the United States.

26. The Plaintiff asserts this complaint against the Defendant as an individual who is a "presumed" or de-facto president of the U. S., instead of the actual president of the United States; although he has been sworn into office and taken an oath to uphold the Supreme Law of the United States; without providing he is old enough, "natural born" both parents were born into the U.S. and has only had U.S. citizenship, and holds some document which gives him the right to be in the United States. His aunt on his birth father's side resides in the U. S. illegally and has not been deported. The Supreme Law is not negotiable and should be upheld. The Defendant may not continue receiving "passes" from U. S. officers who have taken an oath to uphold the Constitution.

27. Hereby with this compliant, the Plaintiff, a U.S. citizen, demands from the Defendant to immediately provide her absolute proof through this court that his mother and his father were both U.S. citizens born in the United States as well as the Defendant was actually born in and on the land of the United States of America with no other citizenships. Any certified authentic "certified" birth certificate of the Defendant will disclose the name of the person and the place where the Defendant's mother and where the Defendant's father was born. Further it will have the hospital where the Defendant was born with the name and the signature of the attending physician. The Defendant is a young man and his birth was when hospitals in the United States were modern and up

 of foreign states far in excess of what the U. S. citizens receive under the Consecution.

35. III section 3 of the Constitution prohibits the U. S. president from providing aide and comfort to those of foreign states at the expense of the U. S. citizens.

36. This action is brought under the above and under the U. S. Constitution Article II, III, VI, 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States and under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Prudential Jurisdiction

37. As the United States gets older and there are more terrorist threats to the security of the U.S. due to the borders being unsecured, this issue will be repeated over and over until the courts take a stand on the issue and uphold the United States Constitution where others have failed to do so. And there will be more as a result of all the 3 braches of the government to provide checks and balances against the other has failed to uphold the highest law, the U.S. Constitution. On its face the Executive branch is the person violating the Constitution. The Defendant has received requests for months by the citizens to provide his certified birth certificate. There has been billboards constructed and clothing manufactured with this request printed thereon. This Defendant has adamantly refused to provide his eligibility data to the United States citizens. As a result, the unrest of all the citizens grows more intense. This has become a state of emergency. The amount of unrest and the number of the lawsuits filed will continued to climb until

this matter is determined by a Federal Court. As well, the People and Plaintiff are becoming restless as to why the Courts are failing to uphold the Supreme Law of the Land. The courts are the very ones who the People believe upholds the law above all.

38. There are only 2 other branches of U.S. government other than the Executive who is solely the Defendant. Congress, both the Senate and the House, failed in their duty to verify the eligibility status of this Defendant prior to his inauguration on January 20, 2009. That leaves only the Judicial Branch. If this issue is passed over and not heard our Country will be destroyed and taken over by foreign governments as currently is being done by this Defendant. There is no passing of the buck under the guise of the "doctrine of prudential". James Madison stated that no matter how much a Justice does not want to get involved in a case or to hear a certain case, it has no choice, as the mandate from the United States Supremacy Clause, Article VI prohibits a court from passing on a complaint that alleges federal constitutional violations as this case surely does. Further, the Supreme Law of the <u>U.S.</u> Constitution Article VI as the Supreme Law of the Land over issues where there is a federal constitutional controversy supersedes any

39. The Plaintiff does ask this court to refuse acceptance of communication with others about this case except for those pleadings filed herein this case as to prevent the appearance of undue influence.

IRREPARABLE HARM

26

25

27

28

- 40. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above as if fully set forth herein.
- 41. The Plaintiff is immediately and irreparably harmed without this judgment including but not limited to:
 - a. As a direct and proximate result of the actions of the Defendant, the Plaintiff no longer has in operation a United States under the protection and control of the Supreme Law of the U.S.
 - b. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant those of unlimited foreign countries may
 - c. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant's Amended Executive order he has violated and circumvented the rights the Plaintiff has to be under the control and protection of the U. S,. Constitution and only be under the control and scrutiny of the U. S. Judicial System, not INTERPOL.
 - d. With this executive order the Defendant has taken away her rights as a U. S. citizen and has given rights to those of foreign birth with no restrictions or accountabilities of the foreign people.
 - e. The Defendant has destroyed the right the Plaintiff has to a government and rights under the U. S. Constitution. Currently the Defendant's allegiance is for his father's foreign allegiance instead of the U. S.
 - f. Actions by the Defendant violate the rights the Plaintiff has under the U.S. Constitution constitutes irreparable harm to the Plaintiff.
 - g. The Plaintiff does not have a U. S. President who has 100% birth allegiance to her Country will and has caused her to loose her freedom, rights and liberty because the Defendant is and will

continued to provide for the benefits and posterity of those of foreign states at the expense of the Plaintiff and her Country the U.S.

- h. Her country's sovereignty being given up by the Defendant so the people of foreign roots outside of the U. S. can police the Plaintiff.
- i. The Defendant has deleted and violated her rights she has as a citizen to be protected under the Supreme Law are signed away by the strike of the Defendant's pen.
- j. Marshall Law with the strike of the pen will be used by the Defendant to take over the government control of Plaintiff and the People.
- k. The defendant has placed the foreign government INTERPOL above the FBI in the United States giving aid to those of foreign power and taking the U.S. Constitutional rights and government away from Plaintiff and the People.
- 1. Placed the foreign government INTERPOL above the United States Constitution showing his allegiance to the foreign powers at the expense of the People of the United States.
- m. Placed the INTERPOL out of the reach of the U.S. government and legal Court destroying the Supreme Power of the Plaintiff and giving the supreme power to those of foreign governments. This is treason.
- n. the Defendant has violated and deleted all the Plaintiff rights under the Supreme Law of safety, inalienable rights, freedom and the Supreme Law by placing her under the INTERPOL jurisdiction and making INTERPOL immune to the United States

- Constitution and U.S. Courts. This gives aide to the foreign powers.
- o. Deleted all the rights the Plaintiff has under the U. S. Supreme Law of the Land by sabotaging her rights by the immunity and other privileges given to the INTERPOL.
- p. The Defendant provides to those of foreign power privileges of owning land and assets but immune to the law of the U. S.; no legal force may using the appropriate steps search and seize any part of their land and possessions and documents.
- q. By allowing the INTERPOL to be immune to FIOL
- r. INTERPOL are working out of our Dept of Justice offices with our own police who are UNDER the control of INTERPOL.
- s. The foreign government police because of the Defendant now have full diplomatic immunity with inviolable archives.
- t. Because of the Defendant's amended Executive Order the Plaintiff and citizens of the US have lost their protection and government under the U.S. Constitution according to this Executive amended order.
- u. Because this Defendant has foreign birth rights he has issued orders and appointment which seek to destroy the U. S.
 Constitution.
- v. It is the highest of national security to have a 100% birth allegiance person in the position of the Executive Office of the President. The plaintiff is harmed as her security is impaired by one of foreign birth who with a stroke of the pen, the Defendant may order Marshall Law and/or the FEMA already in place and

28

put into immediate operation the following: allows the government to take control over all modes of transportation, highways, and seaports; government to seize and control the communication media.;

to take over all electrical power, gas, petroleum, fuels, and minerals;

to take over all food resources and farms; to mobilize civilians into work brigades under government supervision.;

to take over all health, education, and welfare functions;

Designates the Postmaster General to operate national registration of all persons;

to take over all airports and aircraft, including commercial aircraft.;

Housing and Finance Authority to relocate communities, build new housing with public funds, designate areas to be abandoned, and establish new locations for populations;

government to take over railroads, inland waterways, and public storage facilities;

Specifies the responsibility of the Office of Emergency Planning and gives authorization to put all Executive Orders into effect in times of increased international tensions and economic or financial crisis.;

Allows the Federal Emergency Preparedness Agency to develop plans to establish control over the mechanisms of production and distribution, of energy sources, wages, salaries, credit and flow of money in the U.S.A. financial institution in any

undefined national emergency. It also provides that when a state emergency is declared by the President, congress cannot review the action for six months.

42. Unless this Court declares the actions of the Defendant, past and future, unconstitutional, and make a Declaratory Order the Defendant is not constitutionally eligible for the office of the president and/or declares the Defendant to be an imminent danger to the security of the U. S. Constitution and the United States, this Plaintiff has suffered and will suffer in the future irreparable destruction of her safety, freedom and security which today at the time of the filing ,under the Supreme Law were her inalienable rights bestowed upon her as a result of her birth. These above powers given to the U. S. President is the very reason the founders of the Constitution inserted provisions of safety to prevent the enemy from coming through the front door of the U. S. government under the guise of the leader for the protection and upholding of the U. S. Constitution.

COUNT 1: Article 2 § 1 cl 4; Article 3, Article VI

- 43. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 42 as if fully set forth herein.
- 44. Count one is by the Plaintiff against the Defendant for his violation of her right she has to a "natural born" president, <u>United States</u>

 <u>Constitution Article 2 section 1 clause 5</u> which she seeks remedy under the <u>Supreme Law Article 3 and Article VI and section 1983.</u>
- 45. The Defendant has not produced a copy of his medical records, copy of his parents' marriage and divorce records, his adoption records, his elementary records, his records at Occidental College, social security

records, his records at Columbia University, his writings of his Harvard Law Review, an authentic birth certificate showing his birth origins of race and country, and other vital statistic. He has produced to the Plaintiff and the People no authentic record he was even born and is a U. S. citizen; a basic requirement of the Supreme Law of the U. S. 46. There are 3 branches of government in the United States: legislative, executive and judicial. Each of the 3 was designed by the framers of the Constitution to be checks and balances of the other two to prevent one branch abusing too much power. 47. The U.S. Constitution is the Supreme Law of the Land, U.S. Constitution Article VI "This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding". No laws and no people in the United States are above the U.S. Constitution. This means all Presidents, all U. S. Supreme Court Justices; all other individuals in the U.S. must obey the laws of the U.S. Constitution. The Supreme Law says that all U. S. and state officers and judges in every state are mandated to uphold

48. The Supreme Law states the Executive Officer (presumed to be the Defendant) must take an oath before he enters on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirmation: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect

28

and defend the Constitution of the United States." <u>U. S. Constitution</u>

Article 2 section 1 clause 8-9.

49. The U. S. Constitution provides for the judicial branch of government. The judiciary branch of government is the interpreter and the enforcer of the laws of the U. S. using the hierarchy of laws to the situation. While the Judiciary Act of 1789 was enacted, it as a federal law would be superseded by the <u>U. S. Constitution</u>.

50. There were specific threshold parameters required for a person to hold who is elected president. The Supreme Power states, "No person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty-five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States." Article 2, section 1 clause 5, U.S. Constitution. The Plaintiff has seen no proof of the Defendant's "natural born" status; in fact the opposite his autobiography and many sources say his father and his father were born and lived in Kenya and part of the Lau tribe. No one has seen his certified birth certificate, no one remembers him in college, his medical records are not available and his college records and lower school records are not available. The information available about the Defendant is hearsay, no authenticated records for a man who by his own words descends from a birth father whose long history is that of the Lau tribe in Kenya. This violates the "natural born" status of the Constitution for the highest position and Commander in Chief.

27

28

51. When the Plaintiff's forefathers framed the Constitution they were keenly aware that enemies from the outside of the United States would try and infiltrate the U.S. government of freedom, liberty and that which provides a foundation of small government and guarantees the rights of the People. This "natural born" clause was written into the U. S. Constitution to prevent foreign birth parents with allegiance to foreign nations by the very nature of their inheritance. The office of the President is the highest office in the United States. Plaintiff's forefathers wrote into the Constitution that the Office of the President must be a "natural born" citizen meaning the child may never be a natural born if descended by one whose father has never been a U. S citizen. The founders were very familiar with enemies from the inside and knew that would be an easy way for an enemy to take over the U.S. and from the highest position of power to overthrow the government. The "natural born" requirement to be eligible for the office of the president was included in the "Supreme Law of the Land" Article 2 section 1 clause 5. As a private investigator indicated on www.WesternJouralism.com, things in Hawaii where the Defendant is purported to have been born, were much different in 1961 as the state had only been under the union since August 1959. In 1961 Hawaii only required a parent to mail in birth certificate to record a live birth. There does not appear to have been any requirement for the parent to physically appear before a live registrar. It would have been easy for a relative to forge an absent parents signature.

52. No person, no treaty, no law could change or "pass" on this "Supreme

28

Law" or this Supreme Law eligibility requirement of being "natural born". 53. The California Secretary of State, The California Speaker of the House and Congress all failed to verify the Defendant's Constitutional "natural born" eligibility status. The Congress just "stipulated" the Defendant was from Hawaii; holding no hearings on the issue. The Plaintiff believed each time the Officers of the United States would uphold the Supreme Law of which they took an oath under penalty of perjury, but to her surprise and dismay they "passed" on the most crucial issue for the security of the U.S. from foreign lands who wished to destroy the U. S and overthrow it. The Defendant took the same oath to protect and uphold the U.S. Constitution as he was destroying it simultaneously by withholding his birth information from Plaintiff. 54. The Plaintiff and thousands of U.S. citizens have requested from the Defendant with emails and phone calls to provide proof of his eligibility status of being a "natural born" citizen. The Defendant has not provided a "certified" birth certificate which shows which United States hospital he was born in, the name of the attending physician to his birth, the signature of the attending physician to his birth, the name of his mother and the city and state she was born in, the name of his father and the city and state of his birthplace. The Defendant is a young man and the U. S. and their hospitals were modern in the year the Defendant was born. The Plaintiff is about a decade older than the Defendant with a child born about two decades ago. Both of them were born in the U.S. and both have "certified" birth certificates and both contain all the

information referred to above. Both of them had to produce their "certified" birth certificate to receive a social security number from the federal government and to receive a driver's license from the State of California. Nothing less was acceptable for a United States citizen.

Those who are not a U. S. citizen are not required to provide a "certified" birth certificate.

- 55. The Defendant wrote his autobiography titled, "<u>Dreams of my father</u>, <u>race and inheritance</u>" in 1994 and it was re-published in 1995; this self autobiography was placed in the main stream market place.
- a. In the Defendant's autobiography issued in 1994, the Defendant wrote of his roots. He stated he did not remember his first few years but depended on the stories from his mother. No proof has been presented the Defendant's mother was a U. S. citizen at the time of his birth. He said his father was born in Kenya and had come to Hawaii to study. His father left them when he was two. The father had already a wife and children in Kenya, but the Defendant writes his parents were married and his father's father did not want his son to marry a white woman and had threatened to get the Defendant's father's Visa revoked.
- b. Hussein, the Defendant's paternal grandfather did not want his son to marry the Defendant's mother, Ann Dunham. One reason for this according to the Defendant's mother, was that Hussein did not want the Obama blood to be "sullied by a white woman" p. 126 par. 1.
- c. Hussein II Onyango (Defendant's grandfather who was born in Kenya) had attended the Maseno Mission School some 50 miles so of the equator. He was some sort of head of the Tribe Luo. The Defendant's father, Barack Obama, (son of Hussein II Onyango) came to Hawaii to

attend the University. According to the Defendant's autobiography he married his mother; although there has been no proof of a marriage or divorce. The Defendant's father already had a Kenyan wife with children in Kenya.

- d. After Barack Obama, Sr., (father) finished the Hawaii University there was a write up in the newspaper that the Defendant had found with personal belongings and there was no mention of the Defendant or his mother, Ann Dunham. According to the Defendant, his father, Barack Obama Sr., left Hawaii, the Defendant and his mother, to attend Harvard. After graduating he returned to Kenya with a new white wife named Ruth where after they had 3 sons together.
- e. In this book, the Defendant spoke of his father and grandfather being born in Kenya. At this time, Kenya was under British rule and was a British subject, but thereafter obtained its independence and they received their Kenyan citizenship. From the Defendant's autobiography he states that his father was born in Kenya as well as his grandfather. The book is unclear whether the Defendant had both British and Kenyan citizenship.
- f. According to the Defendant's book, <u>Dreams of my father</u>, his mother met another foreign student at the University of Hawaii who his mother married. They took the Defendant with them to Indonesia. The Defendant's mother married this man, Lolo Soetero. Lolo Soetero placed the Defendant in an Indonesian school. The Defendant told of how Lolo Soetero personally taught him about how to survive in Indonesia as if he were an adult. The Defendant saw a corrupt government police system.

g. The book says at about the ages of 6-10 he lived in Indonesia with his mother, Ann Dunham and the man she had married who was his step father. Purportedly, this man, Lolo Soetero, had adopted the Defendant and he received Indonesian citizenship. There was a document retrieved by an investigator of the Indonesia school where the Defendant attended who stated the step father was his father. It said that he was Indonesian and his religion was Islam. In those days Indonesia only allowed their own citizens to attend their schools. So it appears from this book the Defendant could likely have 2-4 citizenships.

h. Lolo Soetero worked for the Indonesian government. His mother taught English at a school. Lolo Soetero took a big hand in raising the Defendant and spending time with him on a daily basis. Instead of playing, Lolo Soetero taught him how to box in an adult manner and how to ignore the plight of the poor to survive. The Defendant's mother and Lolo did not get along and apparently Lolo drank a lot.

j. The Defendant's mother all of a sudden got upset fearing her son was not learning the American way of life, and to correct things she herself started teaching him English lessons and getting him up at 4am. The Defendant was not a willing student for this change of his daily routine. Soon thereafter his mother sent him back to her parents in Hawaii and enrolled him in a private school, Punahou Academy prep a prestigious school although he stated his mother was on food stamps. He felt out of place and students mocked his foreign name and instead of feeling proud of his Kenyan heritage; he felt conflicted.

j. there are no records available. The Defendant writes he was about ten years old and was not happy about being sent back to the states. A few years later his mother divorced Lolo Soetero.

k. To be a "natural born citizen, one had to be born to both a mother and a father born in the U. S. And there is a question if the Defendant's mother was old enough at the time to confer a U. S. citizen birth unless he was actually born on the soil of Hawaii. As well, there has been no proof the Defendant is even a U. S. citizen or even has a Visa. It has been written the Defendant received scholarship funding as a foreign aid student. There is no proof that the Defendant was born in either the US or Kenya. There is no proof that his mother and her parents were even citizens of the United States.

1. Regardless, the Defendant in his own words states his father, Barack Obama, was born in Kenya precluding the Defendant having 100% allegiance to the U. S. in any case scenario preventing the Defendant from ever being eligible for being the president of the U. S. The Plaintiff believes the Defendant knows this as he is a lawyer and that is the reason he has spent money on attorneys locking up his documents. The Defendant spent several years in Indonesia and at the least would have a dual citizenship which would have interfered with any sole allegiance to the U. S. Most importantly, the Defendant has chosen to deny any and all records about himself so there is no records of his actual existence; just a body with no authentic U. S. certification of birth.

m. The Defendant's natural father, Barack Obama Sr., came to visit him one Christmas when he was about ten, returned to Kenya, and later died.

- n. A well known documented fact in the Defendant's book was the Defendant visited Kenya in 1988. He visited his grandmother on his birth father's side, Omyango Obama. He went there to learn more about his family where he met aunts, uncles, and cousins.
- o. The Defendant met Miss. Omoro who was in a British Airways uniform who was familiar with his father's home. She recognized his name. Obama writes, "That had never happened before, I realized; not in Hawaii, not in Indonesia, not in L.A., or New York or Chicago. For the first time in my life, I felt the comfort, the firmness of identity that a name might provide, how it could carry an entire history in other people's memories, so that they might nod and say knowingly, 'Oh, you are so and so's son.' No one here in Kenya would ask how to spell my name, or mangle it with an unfamiliar tongue. My name belonged and so I belonged, drawn into a web of relationships, alliances, and grudges I did not yet understand." P.305, par. 6.
 - p. He met many of the family including his father's sister. P.306.
- q. The Defendant spent at least a month in Kenya after his father's death, getting to know all his big large family and their tribe with generations of history. He could only reflect on their archaic differences from the U. S. This book was a reflection of the Defendant's intense anger and resentment against the white people and against the people of the United States and against the United States Constitution because it prevented him from independently doing whatever he wanted without

having to answer to others and to the U.S. Supreme Law. The Defendant's words and attitude was scathing and arrogant against the U.S. Constitution. He wrote of his overwhelming feeling of hate and anger, p 301.

- r. "I realized that who I was... The pain I felt was my father's pain. My questions were my brothers' questions. Their struggle, my birthright." P 430 p one.
- s. "...what I card about, was no longer just a matter of intellect or obligation, no longer a construct of words. I saw that my life in America—the black life, the white life, the sense of abandonment I'd felt as a boy, the frustration and hope I'd witnessed in Chicago—all of it was connected with this small plot of earth an ocean away, connected by more than the accident of a name or the color of my skin."
- t. "after our engagement, I took Michelle to Kenya to meet the other half of my family" p439 p3.

56. It is Plaintiff's position the Defendant by his own words over and over is clearly not a "natural born" citizen and not eligible to the office of the president. As well, she does not know his legal name but knows he took the oath to uphold to uphold the Constitution by the name of Barrack Obama under penalty of perjury. The burden of proof is upon this Defendant. The burden of proof is on the Defendant to provide absolute proof he was born to both a mother and a father who are U. S. citizens. The Supreme Law demands the president of the U. S. to be a "natural born" citizen. This issue will not go away until the courts uphold the Supreme Law and demand from this Defendant an order to

show cause as to his "natural born" citizenship with proof both parents were United States citizens with his allegiance wholly to the U.S. as is required in the U.S. government for the office of the President, <u>U.S.</u> Constitution Article 2. 57. If the Defendant does not provide to the Plaintiff through this Court he is absolutely Constitutionally eligible to hold the office of the President, the Plaintiff herein ask for relief of a declaratory order to that effect and an injunction to remove the Defendant by force if necessary from the office of the presidency and his occupancy at the White House to be barred forevermore from this position. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant's refusal to uphold the U.S. Constitution by caused destruction to the United States. Any destruction the Defendant has brought to the U.S. Constitution by his acts of destruction is destruction against the Plaintiff. So as the Lady of Liberty would cry so does the head and heart of the Plaintiff as all around her she sees the government, her inalienable rights and the failure of the officers of the U.S. to uphold the U.S. Constitution Article VI and Defendant's acts to destroy its fundamental foundation, U.S. Constitution. 58. Since January 20, 2009, where upon this Defendant was sworn into office of the president without his being verified that he was Constitutionally eligible, he used his platform to intimidate the main stream media to cease their reporting of negative articles about him which the Plaintiff asserts harmed her as it denies her right to uncensored reporting of the press and violating her guaranteed rights she has under the First Amendment. The Defendant initiated numerous

and the Freedom of the Press. The Defendant's continuous agenda is to censor the media and make the internet (cyber) czar his personal mission. The Defendant's intent is to disable the privacy and rights of the U. S. citizen, Plaintiff and insert the Foreign Powers and the take over by the International Foreign People. This violates all rights the Plaintiff has under the U. S. Constitution. The Defendant has on a continuing basis told the Plaintiff (the citizens) one thing and done another with the intent to destroy their U. S. Constitution (Country) until after it is too late.

59. This agenda of the Defendant was with deliberate, calculated actions to destroy the United States which are a symptom and root of his foreign allegiance just as the founding fathers of the Constitution had the ability to foresee. The Defendant also visited Kenya in 2006. There are numerous pictures of him in Kenya in 2006 with throngs of Kenyan's in the streets carrying a huge painting high in the air of the Defendant which the person delivering it to Obama stated, "He is my tribesman," Ochieng said of Obama. Obama from promise to power (2007) by: David Mendell, p 182-183.

60. With each month the Defendant refused to provide his proof of allegiance to the U. S. by his "natural born" status of the highest office in the U. S. the Plaintiff is further harmed by his violations. With each month the Defendant continues his destruction of the U. S. and his agenda of his allegiance to the Foreign Powers causes more harm to Plaintiff. With each months that passes and the U. S. officers fail to uphold the U. S. Constitution, Plaintiff becomes more anxious, afraid for her life and for that of her countries life, and has difficulty going to bed.

The Plaintiff is afraid that each night may be her last nights as a U.S. citizen with her inalienable rights have been destroyed. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant's violation of her inalienable rights and government guaranteed under the Supreme Law of the U.S. Constitution, she becomes more afraid for her country, she knows that all her rights as a U.S. citizen will be destroyed by the Defendant and finally the Supreme Law would cease to protect her. Even now at this filing, the officers in the U.S. have failed to uphold the rights of the Plaintiff under the Supreme Law of her Country, which can be a last sign before revolution. 61. Time is of the essence; as so many U.S. officers have failed to uphold their duty to enforce the Supreme Law. The relief which Plaintiff has asked this Court will fully remedy all harm to her complete satisfaction. 62. The Defendant is developing one branch of government (his) with the appointment of numerous CZARS without the advisement and "CONSENT" of Congress. This is a dangerous violation of the Plaintiff's rights and her right to be safe and secure. The Defendant is taking over government control of the internet by appointing cyber czars to spy on Plaintiff (citizens) under the guise of providing help to the security of the internet. The Defendant has

Amendment right to the Freedom of Speech and under Article 2 Section 2 paragraph 2 of the U.S. Constitution, "He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint

Ambassadors...."With this spy cyber czar, the Defendant is operating as

a self Leader of a Tribe who is all on his own creating his own international government to destroy the U.S. Constitutional Government and inalienable rights of the Plaintiff and replace them with International Powers and International Foreign Laws and People. This is the "foreign" roots of the Defendant for which the founders of the Constitution of which spoke of and prevented with the Article 2 Section 1 clause 5 of the U.S. Constitution; except the U.S. officers and the Defendant failed to uphold their oath of office to uphold the U.S. Constitution of which does not allow for "technicalities" of lower laws such as the Federal Laws or the Executive Orders which are inferior to the Supreme Law which supersedes everything of treaties or people (certainly including foreign ones) of any level. The U.S. Constitution rules as the Supreme Law for any and all People in the United States of America. 63. The Plaintiff is hoping this Honorable Court will order sua sponte for the Defendant to show cause of immediately provide absolute proof his mother and father both of U.S. citizenship at the Defendant's birth and that he was born on U.S. soil himself with only one citizenship; that of the U. S of America. Otherwise, the Plaintiff asks this Honorable Court to uphold, defend, interpret and enforce the Supreme Law of the Land and provide declaratory and injunction order for the Defendant to immediately cease and desist his position as the President of the U.S.

Constitutional eligible U.S. President will assume the duties immediately of being elected and sworn, unless the election is too close to call; this being a case of first impressions. 64. The Plaintiff does not anticipate cooperation from the Defendant and she will ask in her injunction to include a provision in the case the Defendant will remove himself from the White House within 24 hours of the order and if he does not obey the order, the U.S. government/U.S. Marshall will make an attachment and remove the Defendant from the White House. 65. The Plaintiff will further ask the declaratory order/injunction to include that all Executive Orders, appointments, treaties, and other acts of the Defendant will upon the swearing in of the newly elected president, be made null and void as if they never were, as they weren't because the Defendant was never eligible to hold the office. COUNT 2:U. S. Constitution; 1st Amendment; Article 2, 1 cl 8; Article 2 §1; The whole U. S. Constitution. Article I § 9 clause 8. Article 2 §1. 66. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 65 as if fully set forth herein. Count Two is by the Plaintiff against the Defendant for his violation of the rights she has under the U.S. Constitution and the overthrowing of the U.S. Constitution by the Defendant's Amended Executive Order # 12425. Count 2 is by the Plaintiff against the Defendant for his violations of her rights under the United States Constitutional to

to those of terrorist and enemies of the unknown by facilitating their/his foreign takeover of the U.S. Government.

67. The Defendant used his U. S. position of power being driven by his ancestral roots from foreign lands and states and with his lifelong hate of the United States government and the United States Constitution set about making a change to take away that which was rightfully the Plaintiffs and provide those of foreign lands a "pass" to acquire that which violated the <u>Supreme Law</u> and greatly elevated much higher than any of Plaintiff's rights under the Constitution.

68. Timeline of Defendant's actions of providing "immunities and privileges" to those of foreign police who the "U. S" Police and Judicial System do not have. The Defendant saw as a child his great grand father was the king of the tribe and longed to be the same with the visual global award of the United Nations as the King over the Nations instead of the one Country the U. S. he was suppose to be wholly loyal to.

- a. On Sept <u>14</u>, 2009, it was leaked the Defendant would be the chairperson to the United Nations.
- b. On Sept <u>16</u>, 2009, the Defendant signed "amended" executive order #124125 allowing INTERPOL, whom ever owned and wherever located to own their own property on the soil of the United States and their assets would NOT be subject to search or seizure (actually issued on Sept. 17, 2009).
- c. On September <u>23</u>, 2009, the Defendant presided as the chair person over the General Assembly of the United Nations.

d. On October <u>9</u>, 2009, the Defendant accepted a "Noble Peace prize" and money by a foreign entity.

69. In return for the Defendant giving the INTERPOL immunities and privileges which the Plaintiff and the citizens of the U. S. do not have in their own country, the United Nations provided for the Defendant to be awarded with the title of winning the Nobel Peace Prize. The Defendant accepted the title in violation of the U.S. Constitution and with a slap in the face to the United States as he took the World stage as the leader and chairperson of the United Nations. This was in violation of the U. S. Constitution and the rights Plaintiff has under it to have a President who is wholly loyal to the U. S. only. "No <u>Title of Nobility</u> shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, <u>Emolument</u>, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince or foreign State." <u>United States Constitution Article I Section 9 clause 8.</u>

70. The Defendant was driven to use his U. S. position of power to become the ruler of the New World. He was driven by his foreign roots and birthright from his father who was born in Kenya and his upbringing in Indonesia combined with his hatred of the people (white Caucasians) of the United States to provide for the exchange of the possessions and holdings of the people of the United States to be given to those of foreign lands.

71. He did this by providing the foreign powers and foreign states elevated rights the Plaintiff and the U. S. citizens did not have under the U. S. Constitution. The Defendant violated the Plaintiff's rights she has under the U. S. Constitution by placing her under the surveillance, scrutiny, and control of the International Criminal Police Organization. The Defendant provided for the foreign powers and foreign citizens the right to deny the United States and the police in the U. S. and all the U.S. states the right of search and seizure upon warrant from a court as other U. S. Citizens must succumb to or be arrested and jailed. This order by the Defendant violated the right the Plaintiff has under the <u>U. S. Constitution Sixth Amendment.</u>

72. The Defendant placed his priority on assisting the foreign powers of unknown terrorist or enemies and took away the inalienable rights the Plaintiff and the citizens of the country for which he was the presumed president. The Defendant made an amended executive order which gave privileges and immunities to those of foreign states which the Plaintiff did not even have. The Defendant issued an "amended order" that would have the effect of allowing those of foreign lands and those who were not U. S. citizens to acquire land, assets and possessions on United States soil, but not accountable to the laws of the United States. The Defendant did this to take assets and possessions and the potential of same away from Plaintiff (and U. S. citizens) and give to those of foreign lands and who was not U. S. citizens.

74. The Defendant's foreign ancestral roots of his inheritance and presumable dual citizenship provided the foundations for this dictatorship over Plaintiff and the U.S. with his unilateral decision by

23

24

25

26

27

28

his stroke of his pen to give freely that which belongs to the United States (Plaintiff and the citizens) and give to those of foreign states is for the Defendant to overthrow the Supreme Law of the Land with distain for the U.S., while at the same time giving aid to the foreign criminal police and people of who the Defendant can not know there to be no enemies of the U.S. The Defendant has taken the wealth, land and assets of the U.S. and provided them to non U.S. citizens because he hates the U. S government, the white people and wants to give what the U.S. has to those outside of the U.S. His mission based on his birthright has been his goal to destroy the U.S. via destroying the U.S. Constitution. The Supreme Law is a legal road block for those of evil intentions against the U. S government and rights. Instead, the Defendant with arrogance combined with those in power who have failed to uphold the U.S. Constitution have already began to erode the Supreme Law through culture. Once the culture is there the step to bring it to law is much easier. Plaintiff hereby is demanding the Supreme Law of the U.S. be upheld by those who have taken an oath to uphold it. 75. The Defendant quietly and with no press conference, amended the Executive order #124125 giving immunity and privileges to INTERPOL

- (International Criminal Police Organization):
 - a. the right to own property and land to who ever owned and wherever located to own property and their assets would be "immune" to search.
 - b. "The archives of international organizations shall be inviolable",

- c. International organizations including their family, employees, representatives, servants of such officers, shall receive free custom duties and freedom from IRS taxes, Income and foreign investments received from investing in the U. S., and freedom from taxes from interest from banks and deposit interest would not require the International Organizations to pay taxes such as other U. S. citizens pay.
- d. "International organizations shall be exempt from all property taxes imposed by, or under the authority of, any Act of Congress, including such Acts as are applicable solely to the District of Columbia or the Territories".

76. The Defendant took steps to provide the foreign citizens excessive privileges in our United States that the Plaintiff and the U. S. citizens do not enjoy. It is unconstitutional for the president to give individuals or organizations the freedom to not follow the same rules in the U. S. as the citizens do. More importantly, it clearly evidences the Defendant's loyalties to those of foreign citizen at the expense of the citizen for whom the President has taken an oath to protect and uphold their rights. With this Executive order the Defendant has violated the Plaintiff's rights by insuring the penalties such as taxation and privacy rights of search and seizure by allowing the foreign individuals to come into the U. S. and not have the same penalties.

77. This Defendant has violated the Plaintiff's right to freedom and liberty and safety by allowing those of foreign policeman to come into the U.S. with immunity from the Freedom of Information Act. This FOIA is a protection for the Plaintiff. The Defendant as the presumed U.S.

president is looking out for the best interest of the foreign people outside 1 the U.S. instead of the Plaintiff, as a U.S. citizen. This shows the 3 Defendant's allegiance is to that of the foreign country not that of the United States. 5 78. This Defendant has placed the Plaintiff under the surveillance and scrutiny of the INTERPOL, who is not under the 3 branches of the U.S. government's jurisdiction under any condition. However, as a result of the Defendant's "Amended" Executive Order #124125, the Plaintiff is placed under the surveillance and jurisdiction of the INTERPOL and the 10 International government. The INTERPOL is under a International 11 form of government. These acts by the Defendant is an act to giving 12 assistance to the Foreign Individuals and Nations and most likely 13 includes or will include enemies and terrorist; which must be assumed 14 as they are NOT within the United States, or under the control and jurisdiction of the United States. 16 79. Less than a week of issuing this "amended" executive order #124125 17 the Defendant served at the chair person for the General Assembly for the United Nations. Less than 2 weeks after the Defendant served as 19 chairman for the United Nations, he received foreign Nobel Peace prize 20 21 and cash money from foreign governments. 80. This is proof this Defendant is 100% loyal to the foreign nations and 22 23 not to the United States. This is what the founding fathers of the U.S. 24 Constitution warned us about and provided protection from Article 2 25 section 1, U.S. Constitution. 26 81. The Defendant violated the rights the Plaintiff had under the U.S. 27 Constitution which this Defendant's amended executive order #124125

28

Justice in Washington, D.C.

violated. Any type of "International" government police or other foreign power having power over the Plaintiff while she is in and on U.S. soil is in violation of the U.S. Constitution; this Executive Order written by this Defendant as a result of the power of his presumed position, is to over throw and delete the Plaintiff's U.S. Constitutional rights and give rights to the foreign powers which is a over throw of the U.S. government as it stands in the Supreme Law. This "amended" order is the Defendant re-writing the Constitution solely by himself through Executive Orders.

82. INTERPOL has their U.S. headquarters at the U.S. Department of

83.On October 9, 2009, the Defendant was the chair person for the United Nations. This was reward for the Defendant's delivery of the Untied States to the foreign states and foreign police, where they may keep the U.S. and Plaintiff (and all people in the U.S.) under surveillance, build their buildings, buy land, acquire money and possessions on the U.S. soil without adhering to the Laws of the U.S. like Plaintiff and the citizens. This throw over of the U.S. governing laws is a violation of the rights the Plaintiff has to be governed and protected by the United States Constitution. Instead the Defendant has given the rights of the Plaintiff and others to foreign powers. This is an act of the Defendant of overthrowing the U.S. Government; and a direct and proximate result of the Defendant's birth being of foreign father with no allegiance to the United States.

84. Plaintiff asserts harm and damages as a direct result of the Defendant's adamant refusal to provide proof of his "natural born"

constitutional status. These foreign roots of birth inheritance are a dangerous threat to the security of the U.S. where those terrorist and/or foreign powers and numerous International unknown agents who have been given this Unconstitutional "pass", just like the "pass" the Defendant has received all his life here in the U.S.; no questions asked, no proof given, all rights and privileges bestowed. The Defendant is operating out of his "Trojan Horse" in the form of the White House with the Defendant over throwing his powers by giving aid to the enemy/foreign countries with all the secrets of the U.S. government of the U.S. of America and officer after officer gives him a "pass". 85. The harm to the Plaintiff is that her safety, freedom and security have been destroyed by the Defendant. The Plaintiff is afraid to so to bed at night. There has been an increase in the amount of plane activity over the Los Angeles skies from about 2-5 am. The Plaintiff is fearful her country will be over taken as a result of these immunities and privileges given to the INTERPOL. The Defendant has given up the sovereignty of the United States via this amended Executive order #124125. The Defendant has taken away all the rights the Plaintiff had under the Supreme Power has by placing her under the control of this International Police Government. The Defendant, just like he planned has destroyed the Plaintiff's blueprint (U.S. Constitution). The Defendant puts the U.S. citizen's under the surveillance of the International Criminal Police, but gives the INTERPOL complete immunity for any legitimate search or seizure against them or their belongings on U.S. soil. The Defendant continued to assist the enemy and the foreign individuals to allow them the rights of the citizens by

allowing the alleged criminal in 911 a civil trial. Plaintiff brings before this Court her blueprint of her Country, the U. S. Constitution. She requests from this Court a declaratory order and permanent injunction again this Defendant from serving as the U. S. President as he has violated the rights Plaintiffs has and has given aid, immunities and privileges to those of foreign citizenship and unknown terrorist at the expense of the Plaintiff's rights. The Defendant provided for the benefits of the non-citizens instead of the Plaintiff, the U. S. citizens and the security of her Country.

86. The Defendant failed to provide proof he is a "natural born" citizen

with whole loyalties to the United States of America. Otherwise there is the on its face facts the Defendant has ties of his birthright by allegiance to other countries. Never the less the Defendant's chairing of the United Nations is a violation against a right under the U. S. Constitution that the Plaintiff has to have a wholly loyal president. This Defendant's acting as the chairperson of the United Nations is an act of treason against the United States Constitution. This leadership position of the Defendant practice simultaneously while the World presumes the Defendant is the President of the United States is a violations of the Plaintiff's right she has under the Constitution to have a president who is loyal to the United States in his "natural born" status. The Defendant serving as the chairperson for the United Nations was viewed on national Television networks around the country.

87. The Executive Officer is bound by oath to uphold the <u>United States</u>

<u>Constitution</u>. "......The Senators and Representatives before

mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all

executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States." The Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution Article VI provides for this court providing remedy as requested. 88. There were fundamental reasons the founding father of the Constitution required the President and V. President to be "natural born" citizens. For an individual just like the Defendant who had allegiance to other countries had significant secrets of the U. S. combined with the destruction the Defendant has done just in this claim, the U.S. may never recover. Past FEMA "Executive orders" gives the "right" to the president any times he declares emergency measures, to take over the transportation, highways, seaports, seize and control the media, all electrical control of the power, gas, fuels, minerals, transportation including personal cars, trucks, vehicles, all highways, waterways, all food resources and farms, allows the government to mobilize civilians into work brigades under government supervision, all health, education, welfare functions, housing and finance authority to relocate communities, railroads, public storage facilities, give the Executive all authorization to put all these order into effect with a stroke of the President's hand in times of increased international tension and economic or financial crises, gives the authority to the Department of Justice to carry out all the orders from the Executive office (president), allow the Federal Emergency agency to provide mechanisms of production and distribution, of energy sources, wages, salaries, credit

and the flow of money in U.S. financial institution in any undefined emergency situation, provides that when a state of emergency is declared by the President, Congress cannot review the action for six months. To assert any of these orders all a president has to do is sign them. Signing them would suspend the Constitution and the Bill of Rights; just what this Defendant would love to do; delete the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. 89. The Defendant has time and time again proved himself to be an individual who has loyalties to other foreign nations and not to the United States of America, is a security disaster that has violated the rights of the Plaintiff. The security of the United States and of the Plaintiff is a matter of immediate national security to the continued Freedom, Liberty and Pursuit happiness of the Plaintiff. Plaintiff asks this Court to order sua sponte to the Defendant, an order to show cause of absolute proof of his eligibility constitutional status to be the President of the United States. 90. This Honorable Court is MANDATED from the highest Supreme Law

90. This Honorable Court is MANDATED from the highest Supreme Law of the Land. That highest Supreme Law of the Land is NOT Barack Obama; but IS the <u>United States Constitution Article VI</u>, <u>Article 2 and Article 3</u>.

91.<u>U. S. Constitution Article 2 section I</u>; the oath the Defendant took: "...to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend, the Constitution of the United States".

92. The Defendant has used his power to allow the building and amassing of fortunes, securing acres of land to build cities and fortresses and the unknown-terrorist as he has issued them immunity against the

U.S. police, they are immune to the law of the states and the U.S where the government may NOT search and seize any of their belongings on their land in the U.S.; and they are exempt from paying any state, federal, income, local and other taxes. This is an overthrow of the U.S. government and the Plaintiff's rights she has under the U.S. Constitution. The Defendant has used the power of his position to give aide, land, privilege of no taxes, privileges of no search and seizure, privilege governments of immunity to the U.S. government at the expense of the U.S. government to give the benefits without their conforming to the laws of the United States. This blanket overthrow and violations of the Plaintiff's rights by the Defendant is a direct and proximate result of violations of the rights the Plaintiff has to be protected under the Constitution NOT under INTERPOL and foreign government. The Defendant took an oath to protect the Plaintiff; instead he is as a direct and proximate result of his foreign birth evidencing his allegiance to those of foreign citizenship and placing the Plaintiff's safety in severe jeopardy. 92. The Defendant and his people for over a year have been threatening and intimidating the main news networks so they will censor the main stream news by only running positive stories. The Defendant has been initiating various departments and directing his people to put pressure on various news organizations to censor the Freedom of the Speech and the Press, thereby violating the right the Plaintiff has under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. The Defendant issued a memo to Humana intimidating them to cease and desist about seniors

may loose certain benefits with the pending medical legislation, which

was true. Since before he took office, the Defendant has been threatening main news media to not report negative articles about him abridging the Plaintiff's right to uncensored media. This information in this complaint was censored by the main news media and which the Plaintiff had to investigate to receive it. This Defendant violated the First Amendment rights the Plaintiff has to the Freedom of Speech and of the Press.

The violation caused injury to the Plaintiff as she could not freely get the news she needed to apprise herself of the events surrounding the Defendant and her country. The Defendant's abridged the Plaintiff's most basic Freedom of Speech and of the press.

93.On September 23, 2009, the Defendant assumed the role of chairman to foreign nations and most likely enemies of the United States. This is an act of treason that was televised all across the World for all to view.

In the alternative this caused the Plaintiff harm from the violation of the Defendant against the allegiance to her United States by the Defendant.

94.On September 23, 2009, The Defendant was the first ever United States president to chair a United Nation General Assembly directing them to move the World in a new direction. This being the chairperson of the United Nations is a step taking the United States in the New World Order. The <u>United States Constitution</u> does not include a New World Order and the Plaintiff as a United States citizen has a right under the Constitution which this Defendant violated, to have a president who is wholly loyal to the United States without partial or whole loyalty to the United Nations and to foreign countries and

individuals of foreign land allegiance. The Plaintiff is requesting a declaratory order and injunction against the Defendant to be removed from his presumed position/position of the office of the U.S. President.

COUNT 3: Article 1,§ 9,cl 8

95. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 94 as if fully set forth herein.

96.Count 3 is by the Plaintiff against the Defendant for his violations of the rights she has under the U. S. Constitution to have a U.S. President who does not accept titles and gifts, without the consent of the

Congress." No $\underline{\text{Title of Nobility}}$ shall be granted by the United States:

And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument,

Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince or foreign

State". United States Constitution Article 1, section 9, clause 8.

Emolument is defined as the returns arising from office or employment usually in the form of compensation or perquisites.

97. The President shall, at stated Times, receive for his Services, a Compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the Period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that Period any other Emolument from the United States, or any of them." U.S. Constitution Article 2 section 1 clause 7.

98.On October 9, 2009, a Nobel Peace Committee from Norway presented to the Defendant (the presumed president/president of the United States) the Nobel Peace Prize. As well as accepting the Nobel Peace Prize the Defendant accepted the money which accompanied it.

What the Defendant will do with this money is immaterial; for this claim

is only concerned with the "acceptance" by the Defendant without consent by the Congress which violates a right she has under the Supreme Law. This violates the right Plaintiff has under the Constitution to have a President who is free from accepting gifts, awards and money from foreign countries; from having a president who is loyal first and foremost to the foreign power instead of the United States of where he holds the highest office of the United States of America. This is why the founders of the U.S. Constitution placed the "natural born" U.S. citizen condition as a requirement for the position of the U.S. Presidency. The founders insured the posterity of the U.S. Constitution by denying those with foreign ancestry and birthright to the highest position in the United States. This is to prevent the entrance of those who would like to destroy the U.S. as a result of their allegiance to other foreign states. This Nobel Peace prize and money gift was given to the Defendant after he issued his amended Executive order # 12425 for giving the INTERPOL and their "servants", people, assistance and others the right to not pay for custom duties and not pay any taxes on the money they made, the interest on bank accounts, etc. They can not be searched and seized for any conditions, they are immune to FOIA request; all rights the Defendant bestowed onto them and which the Plaintiff as a US citizen does not have. These are symptoms of the Defendant's allegiance to the foreign states while degrading the U.S. Constitution in his amended Executive Order. He did not call a press conference to issue this amended Executive Order; instead he wrote it on the 16th and quietly issued it on the 17th.

99. This Nobel Peace Prize is a giving of title and a giving of money by those of foreign countries which was accepted by the Defendant on live national Television for all to see. The Defendant now was obligated to give back to the foreign governments something in return. The Norwegian Peace prize Committee is not the United States. The Defendant has been presumed he is the president of the United States since January 20, 2009. By the Defendant accepting this Nobel Award and money it shows his allegiance to foreign powers not of the United States. It shows allegiance to the foreign powers by the Defendant's arrogant insult and violation to his oath to uphold and protect and defend the U.S. Constitution. The Supreme Law stated he must ask the permission and consent of Congress as he did not do. His position as the President required that consent, as his position was not one of dictatorship/Totalitarianism under the Supreme Law, but one of the 3 branches of U.S. government providing checks and balances to insure the other 2 branches are not assuming too much power. The Defendant chose the foreign power; not allegiance to the United States and the Supreme Law by which he had taken an oath to protect the Constitution. The receiving of the Congress permission was a condition to and of holding the Presidential position in the United States. This violated the right the Plaintiff has to have a president free from accepting awards/titles from foreign countries and money gifts from foreign countries. When money gifts and foreign awards are accepted, it places the head of the U.S. branch of Executive government in a position of being beholden to a foreign power to give something back in

return; this is why it is constitutionally forbidden by the Supreme Law of the Land.

100. A President of the United States' loyalties are to be wholly to the United States of America and to its citizens. These actions of this Defendant tell on its face to the World, the Defendant's loyalties are to foreign countries and NOT to the United States. The Defendant's blatant and flagrant disregard for his oath and the Supreme Law has been the foundational theme of the Defendant's agenda. The Defendant's agenda is to crush the Constitutional rights of the citizens while replacing it with unlimited rights of those of foreign birth to replace the people in the United States and give it to the foreign people with him as the dictator.

101.As a proximate result of the Defendant's acceptance of a "Nobel Peace Prize" recipient award and money gift with out the consent of Congress and during the same time period he was the presumed president of the United States the Plaintiff's security, freedom and safety under the United States Constitution are hereby voided. The Plaintiff's harm is she now has a presumed President/President in office that has shown to the World his loyalties are NOT to the United States, but instead his loyalties are to foreign countries in the World. By the Defendant's arrogance and violation against the very requirement of his position of the Executive Branch of government he has shown his distain for the United States and the Supreme Law he took an oath under penalty of perjury to uphold and protect the U. S. Constitution. The Plaintiff no longer has a country where by the officers uphold and protect her rights and government under the highest Supreme Law.

102. The Plaintiff now has no security of her Country as it is being executed by the Defendant who ignores with distain the Supreme Law of the Land. She has no security of her Country against the enemies who would pilfer the land of the United States and make the Plaintiff an individual of no hope like the Defendant describes in his autobiography of his growing up and being educated in living in foreign nations. As a result, the Plaintiff is constantly fearful because in culture in her Country the leader (Defendant) follows his own laws, not those of the Supreme Law of the United States. It is with certainly that the first step of the overthrow of a government is to blatantly ignore and violate the rights of the citizens and the restriction on the office. The Plaintiff is in the process of loosing her rights to freedom, liberty and prosperity. Without the Courts intervention and upholding the Supreme Law of the Land, this destruction of the U.S. by this Defendant will continue until it becomes a bloody revolution as the People will be forced to rise up again against widespread unlawful officers acting under the guise of the Supreme Law but instead are acting in violation of the U.S. Supreme Law. 103. The Defendant has exhibited arrogant expectation of the officials in the U.S giving him a pass in the seat of the U.S. presidency in the White House which is best described as his Trojan Horse to destroy and demolish the United States and the U.S. Constitution by his Executive Orders and proving aide and pass to those of foreign birth and nation at the expense of the Plaintiff's rights she has under the Supreme Law of which no man nor U.S. Court has the right to deny. There would be

if this Honorable Court denies or dismisses this claim, Plaintiff's
Country will continue to be destroyed and her inalienable rights she has
under the Constitution will be formalized. This Court is mandated by
law to uphold the rights of the citizens to prevent the destruction of the
United States and its Constitution. Loyalty to the US is the reason the
natural born citizen clause was inserted into the Constitution. The
Plaintiff requests declaratory and injunction against the Defendant;
declaring him ineligible to be a U. S. President with the immediate
swearing in of V. President Biden until the Congress can arrange for an
emergency presidential election. All appointments, orders, and other
binding acts by the Defendant will be null and void as soon as the new
president who is elected is sworn into office.

Prayer for Relief

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court will enter judgment as follows:

- 1. Issue sua sponte an immediate order to demand the Defendant show cause that both his parents were U. S. citizens when he was born with the ability to meet the U.S. Constitutional "natural born" requirement for the position of the President of the United States.
- 2. This Honorable Court will refuse the acceptance of any and all outside communication accepting only communications filed as pleadings within this lawsuit.
- 3. Judgment in the form of a Declaration which states the Defendant has failed to provide proof he is Constitutionally qualified as a "natural born" citizen as required by the U.S. Constitution to be the President.
- 4. Declare the Defendant is guilty of Treason.

17

21

22

23

24

25

26

- 5. Permanent Injunction against the Defendant to the office and position of the President of the United States of America and barred from this office ever after. The Defendant to be barred for ever to this office of the U. S. President and barred to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United States.
- 6. Order injunction the Defendant will remove himself from the office of the President and from the White House within 24 hours of this order. Attachment and force is to be used to remove the Defendant from this office if he does not remove himself within 24 hours.
- 7. Declaratory Order the Defendant's swearing into the office of the President of the United States on January 20 and 21 of 2009, is hereby null and void as if it never was.
- 8. Declaratory order that any and all Executive Orders, treaties, and all other acts made by this Defendant from his inauguration date of January 20, 2009 to the present are null and void upon the inauguration of the next president.
- 9. The next in line eligible individual, the V. President, Joe Biden, whose position had also required the "natural born" eligibility, would be the President of the United States.
- 10. All appointment made by the Defendant and as a result of his occupancy of position of president will be null and void upon the inauguration of a newly elected president.
- 11. Within 60 days or sooner the Congress would arrange for an emergency election for the People to elect a constitutionally eligible president of the United States.

27

1	12. The newly elected president would take the oath of office					
2	immediately upon the winner being declared.					
3	13. Declaratory order The Amended Executive Order #124125 is					
4	declared unconstitutional and hereby null and void.					
5	14. All judgment for the Plaintiff.					
6	15. All court cost of the suit and other Judgment as deemed just by the					
7 8	Court.					
9	Dated: January 22, 2010					
10	Los Angeles, California					
11	Respectfully submitted,					
12	Dutto Desca					
13	Ruth Jones,					
14	Plaintiff in pro se					
15						
16	VERIFICATION					
17	I, Ruth Jones, a citizen of the United States and a resident of Los					
18	Angeles County, State of California, and the Plaintiff in this complaint. I					
19						
20 21	declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of					
22	America the foregoing factual averments are true and correct to the best					
23	of my knowledge and belief.					
24	January 22, 2010 Ruth hones					
25	Los Angeles, California Ruth Jones					
26						
27						
28						

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Gary A. Feess and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Patrick J. Walsh.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV10- 1075 GAF (PJWx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge

NOTICE TO COUNSEL

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

[X]	Western Division	[]	Southern Division		Eastern Division		
	312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8		411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053		3470 Twelfth St., Rm.	13	
	Los Angeles, CA 90012		Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516		Riverside, CA 92501		

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

Ruth Jones P.O. Box 596 Beserly Nills, Ca 90213 email: opportunity think eyahoo, NO PhoNe FOR OFF	ICE USE ONLY
	DISTRICT COURT T OF CALIFORNIA
Ruth Jones V. PLAINTIFF(S) Barack Hussein Obama II; AKA BARRY Soctoro, Steve Danham, Barack Steve Obama, Unknown name Doe 1-10; in his individual	CV10-01075 GAF (PJV
Unknown name Doe 1-18; in his individual lapacity as a regular person, inhis individual capacity as the presum of president of the United States and in his official capacity as a proper president of the United States.	ISE CILLY SUMMONS
TO: DEFENDANT(S): Barak Hussein Olyma	I
A lawsuit has been filed against you. Within	2 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer Ruth Jones, whose address is 502/3. If you fail to do so,
	Clerk, U.S. District Court AMY GRAGERA
Ose oo adys ij the dejendam is the Onited States of a Onited States t	EUSE Court SEAL
50 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].	

SUMMONS

CV-01A (12/07)

UNITED STATES STRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT C ALIFORNIA

	CIVIL COVER SHEET							
I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are represe	efendants U.S.O	Pfice	of the F	resider	+	-		
Ruth Jones			Barack H	1035	ein Ol	bama,		- ,/
•			Presid	ent	of th	V.5.		
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telepho yourself, provide same.)	ne Number. If you are	representing A	ttorneys (If Known)					
Ruth Jones P.O. Box 596 Beverly Wills, (A9 No Phone	- 1/2							
No Phone	02/3							
IL BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an X in o			IP OF PRINCIPAL PAR n one box for plaintiff and			Only		
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff ☐ 3 Federal C Government	Question (U.S. cnt Not a Party)	Citizen of This St		F DEF	Incorporated or F of Business in the	•	PTF □4	DEF □4
N -	(Indicate Citizenship in Item III)	Citizen of Anothe	r State 🗆 2	: □2	Incorporated and of Business in Ar	-	□5	□5
:		Citizen or Subject	of a Foreign Country 🔲 3	□3	Foreign Nation		□6	□6
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one box only.)								
↑ 1 Original □ 2 Removed from □ 3 Removed from Proceeding State Court App		einstated or 🗆 5 ° eopened	Transferred from another d	istrict (spe	Distr	rict Judg	eal to L e from istrate	
V. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY D	EMAND: Yes	No (Check 'Yes'	only if demanded in compla	int.)		leclarate	201	ords
CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.P. 23: Yes X	. /	1	ONEY DEMANDED IN (INT: S O	ie Ciul Ma		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	1		·			atutes unless dive	ersity.)	-
U.S. Constitution Article 11.11	VI: U.5.0	constitut	idnal Viola-	tion	ho it plair.	of Consti	tudi	<u>od.</u>
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box	onty.)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
OTHER STATUTES CONTR	ACT	TORTS	TORTS	Р	RISONER	LAB	OR	
☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 110 Insurance		RSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL		ETITIONS	□ 710 Fair Lal	oor Sta	ndards
☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 130 Miller Ac		Airplane Airplane Product	PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud	1	Motions to Vacate Sentence	Act □ 720 Labor/N	Agmt.	
☐ 450 Commerce/ICC ☐ 140 Negotiable	e Instrument	Liability	☐ 371 Truth in Lending		Habeas Corpus	Relation	15	
Rates/etc. □ 150 Recovery	· .	Assault, Libel & Slander	☐ 380 Other Personal	□ 530		☐ 730 Labor/N	_	
☐ 460 Deportation Overpaym ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced Enforcem	. 117 330	Fed. Employers'	Property Damag 385 Property Damag		Death Penaity Mandamus/	Reportion Disclose	_	t
and Corrupt Judgment		Liability	Product Liability		Other	☐ 740 Railway		
Organizations ☐ 151 Medicare	Act □ 340	Marine Marine Product	BANKRUPTCY		Civil Rights	☐ 790 Other L		
☐ 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 152 Recovery	of Defaulted	Liability	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158		Prison Condition RFEITURE /	Litigatio ☐ 791 Empl. R		
☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV Student L ☐ 810 Selective Service Veterans)		Motor Vehicle	☐ 423 Withdrawal 28		PENALTY	Security		-
☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ ☐ 153 Recovery	ردد اسا	Motor Vehicle Product Liability	USC 157		Agriculture	PROPERTY		FTS
Exchange Overpayn		Other Personal	CIVIL RIGHTS ☐ 441 Voting	1	Other Food & Drug	 □ 820 Copyrig □ 830 Patent 	hts	
USC 3410 USC Stockhold		Injury Personal Injury-	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment		Drug Related	□ 840 Tradem	ark	
□ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 190 Other Co		Med Malpractice	☐ 443 Housing/Acco-		Seizure of	SOCIAL SI		TY
☐ 89 Agricultural Act ☐ 195 Contract]	Product 365	Personal Injury-	mmodations ☐ 444 Welfare		Property 21 USC 881	□ 861 HIA (13 □ 862 Black L		23)
☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Liability Act ☐ 196 Franchise	□ 368	Product Liability Asbestos Personal		1	Liquor Laws	□ 863 DIWC/I	~ .	
☐ 893 Environmental Matters REAL PRO		Injury Product	Disabilities -	□ 640	R.R. & Truck	(405(g)		
■ 894 Energy Allocation Act ■ 210 Land Con		Liability	Employment		Airline Regs	□ 864 SSID Ti □ 865 RSI (40		I
☐ 895 Freedom of Info. Act ☐ 220 Foreclosu ☐ 900 Appeal of Fee Determi- ☐ 230 Rent Leas	re & Ejectment □ 462	MMIGRATION Naturalization	☐ 446 American with Disabilities -		Occupational Safety /Health	FEDERAL T		ATS
nation Under Equal 240 Torts to I.	and	Application	Other	□ 690	•	□ 870 Taxes (U.S. Pl	
Access to Justice ☐ 245 Tort Prod	uci islability 1	Habeas Corpus- Alien Detainee	440 Other Civil	1		or Defer		v 26
☐ 950 Constitutionality of ☐ 290 All Other State Statutes	Keal Property ☐ 465	Other Immigration				☐ 871 IRS-Thi (USC 76		y 20
State Statutes		Actions	Constitutional	1.				
	1		TRIGHTS			<u>l</u>		
			,					

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number: CV10-01075

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

Case 2:10-cv-01075-GAF-PJW Document 1 Filed 02/12/10 Page 64 of 64

UNITED STATES TRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT O. ALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Ha If yes, list case number(s):	s this action been pr	reviously filed in this court ar	nd dismissed, remanded or closed? No 🗆 Yes		
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have If yes, list case number(s):	e any cases been pre	eviously filed in this court the	at are related to the present case? INO □ Yes		
DC.	Arise from the same Call for determinati For other reasons w	e or closely related transaction on of the same or substantial could entail substantial duplic	ons, happenings, or events; or ly related or similar questions of law and fact; or eation of labor if heard by different judges; or , and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.		
IX. VENUE: (When completing the	-		• •		
			if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. this box is checked, go to item (b).		
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
LOS ANGE	LES (OUNTY			
(b) List the County in this District; Check here if the government, it	California County o	utside of this District; State i yees is a named defendant.	f other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. If this box is checked, go to item (c).		
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
			Washington D.C.		
(c) List the County in this District; Note: In land condemnation ex			f other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose.		
County in this District:*		······	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
LOS ANGEL	ES CC	DUNTY			
* Los Augeles, Orange, San Bernar Note: In land condemnation cases, us			an Luis Obispo Counties		
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (OR PRO PER):	Ruth Jone	Date /-22-2010		
or other papers as required by lav	e CV-71 (JS-44) Ci v. This form, approv	vil Cover Sheet and the infoned by the Judicial Conference	mation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ing the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)		
Key to Statistical codes relating to So	•				
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of	Cause of Action		
861	НІА	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))			
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)			
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))			
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))			
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.			
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. (g))			

CV-71 (05/08)